
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q5300/D/17/3180830
100 Gladbeck Way, Enfield EN2 7EN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammad Rezvan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Enfield.
 - The application Ref 17/02015/HOU, dated 6 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the appeal building and the surrounding area
 - and on the living conditions of future occupiers of the development with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace in the rear row of housing set out in a courtyard formation off Gladbeck Way. The garden is to the rear and the side due to the triangular corner siting, with a block of two garages adjoining the next row of terraces alongside the side garden to the appeal site.
4. The terraces at this corner are set down below slightly rising wooded land behind No 100 and No 98 and the proposed development would occupy the majority of the space on that side. The extension would build out in excess of 5m roughly, continuing level with the roof and frontage of the existing dwelling. Although in some views the development would be partially screened by the garages, it would come in close proximity to them and the first floor and extended roof would be readily visible above them. Due to its bulk and size, almost doubling the frontage of the original dwelling, the extension would be disproportionate to the original building and in the streetscene and would give the corner a particularly dense built up appearance that would be out of

keeping with the rest of the surroundings. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

5. On that basis I conclude this development would conflict with the London Borough of Enfield's 2014 Development Management Document Policies DMD8, DMD14 and DMD37, and Core Strategy Policy 30 of The Enfield Plan: Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which together amongst other things seek to secure high quality development that reflects its surroundings.

Living Conditions

6. A narrow passageway behind a wall and arched gate roughly 1.5m wide would divide the proposed extension from the pitched roof garage block directly in front. The first garage belongs to No 100 and has already been converted for domestic use, with side openings onto the garden. There is a further garage attached to No 98, where the two storey terraces continue. Consequently the outlook of the front windows of the proposed development would be roughly north east enclosed between the flank wall of its own single storey garage with the gate and wall to the east, and the flank wall of No 98 above.
7. As a result the front of the ground floor room in the development would be in a dark and cramped location that would be restricted in light and outlook by the garage and the buildings just in front. However, to offset that there would be rear windows facing roughly south westerly and the room would not be especially deep, so that I find adequate light and outlook would be available from the rear of the room. Although due to being above the garages the front first floor room would have better outlook, this would still be enclosed to some extent by the two storey flank wall a relatively short distance away. Having said that, the separation distance of over 7m approximately to the proposed first floor windows would allow more light and outlook generally than at ground floor. Consequently I find there would be no significant resulting harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of the development with regard to light and outlook overall.
8. Therefore I conclude that the development would not conflict with the London Borough of Enfield's 2014 Development Management Document Policies DMD8 and DMD37 in terms of protecting the living conditions of residents.

Conclusion

9. I have taken account of the need for family accommodation by the appellant, but this and any other matters do not outweigh the harm to character and appearance identified above. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR